



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

Mr.

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,592	09/08/2003	Jamey Graham	015358-005710US	1929
7590 04/05/2007 Blakely Sokoloff Taylor and Zafman LLP 12400 Wilshire Boulevard Suite 700 Los Angeles, CA 90025		EXAMINER RIES, LAURIE ANNE		
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2176		
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS	04/05/2007		PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/658,592	GRAHAM, JAMEY	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Laurie Ries	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 December 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 25-47 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 25-47 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 08 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Request for Continued Examination, filed 26 December 2006, to the Original Application, filed 8 September 2003.
2. The rejection of claims 25-46 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller (U.S. Patent 6,613,100 B2) in view of Koppolu (U.S. Publication 2001/0020243 A1) has been withdrawn, however, new grounds of rejection have been added under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
3. Claims 25-47 are pending. Claim 47 has been added. Claims 25, 32, 39, 46, and 47 are independent claims.

Examiner's Note

4. Please note: There are two separate grounds of rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) listed in this Office action.

Request for Continued Examination

5. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 26 December 2006 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 25-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller (U.S. Patent 6,613,100 B2) in view of IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin ("Method for Providing a Summary for Web Page Links"), hereafter referred to as "IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin".

Regarding independent claims 25, 32, 39, 46, and 47, Miller teaches:

A method, used in a computer system that includes a user input device coupled to a processor, a display and a memory, for viewing at least one of a plurality of documents, including a document selected as a current document displayed in a first display area of the display (See Figures 2-5 and Abstract, teaching fetching and viewing a plurality of documents represented by thumbnail images and a display area displaying current document), the method comprising:

(a) in response to a first signal from the user input device (See Miller, Figure 3, item 340, user-input device), corresponding to a movement of pointer in first display area (See Miller, Column 6, lines 56 through Column 7, lines 1-29, and Column 4, lines 35-45, wherein Miller teaches a mouse or pointer movement to select document) fetching and displaying in a second display area of the display a representation of content of another document associated by a link to the current document, without selecting the other document as the current document and displaying the other document in the first display area of the display (See Miller, Column 8, lines 9-28 and Figure 5, teaching other display areas 220-250 for displaying thumbnail images of web pages which are linked and related to the currently accessed web page that appears on the display panel 260 (see Miller, Figure 2B);

(b) in response to a second signal indicative of a selection of the link within the document currently being displayed from the user input device, the second signal distinguishable from the first signal, selecting the other document as the current document (See Miller, Column 4, lines 39-44 and Column 6, lines 50-66, teaching that a user selects appropriate thumbnail via user-input device);

(c) displaying the other document as the current document in the first display area of the display (See Miller, Column 8, lines 9-28, teaching that when thumbnail is selected by the user, it causes the web browser to displayed the selected web page on the web browser's display section 130); and

(d) repeatedly performing steps (a), (b), and (c), re-using the first and second display areas of the display, to present different documents in the plurality of documents to user (See Miller, Column 8, lines 21-47, teaching that the user selects thumbnail image of a web page; the web page is displayed and all of the URLs contained within the web page are displayed as thumbnails images of web pages that are associates with the URLs).

Miller further teaches that the user may also select the document represented by the link such that the document is displayed as the current document (See Miller, Figure 4, element 450, and Column 7, lines 48-52).

Miller does not teach expressly displaying in a second display area of the display a representation of content of another document associated by the link to the current document without selecting the other document as the current document and further without displaying the other document in the first display area of the display.

IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin teaches providing a summary of a document represented by a web page link in a pop-up box (i.e. second display area) rather than loading the link when the user performs an input action (See IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin, Page 3, 1st paragraph). While IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin does not teach expressly that the input action includes a mouse-over, it was well known in the art

at the time of the invention to activate various features on a Web page by performing a mouse-over action, providing the benefit of allowing the user to activate the various features of the Web page without expending unnecessary actions, such as clicking the mouse button.

Miller and IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing hypermedia data.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the display of a pop-up box including a summary of the document represented by a link of the IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin with the document viewing system and method of Miller. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide additional information pertaining to the document associated with the hyperlink in order to allow a user to make the determination as to whether he would like to load the document before expending the time necessary to load the document. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin with Miller in order to provide additional information pertaining to the document associated with the hyperlink in order to allow a user to make the determination as to whether he would like to load the document before expending the time necessary to load the document to obtain the invention as specified in claims 25, 32, 39, 46, and 47.

Regarding dependent claims 26, 33, and 40, Miller teaches:

wherein said representation of content is a thumbnail image of the document (See Miller, Column 8, lines 9-28, teaching a thumbnail image of a web page).

Regarding dependent claims 27, 34, and 41, Miller teaches:

wherein said thumbnail image further includes highlighting of concepts of interest to the user contained within the document (See Miller, Column 6, lines 50-66, and Column 7, lines 25-39, teaching that thumbnails are displayed corresponding to the chosen category based on user preferences).

Regarding dependent claims 28, 35, and 42, Miller teaches:

wherein said plurality of documents in a non-directed arrangement comprises pages of the World Wide Web (See Miller, Column 8, lines 9-20 and Figure 5, teaching viewing a plurality of documents via Internet Explorer).

Regarding dependent claims 29, 36, and 43, Miller teaches:

wherein said plurality of documents includes Hyper Text Markup Language (HTML) documents (See Miller, Column 1, lines 29-43 and Column 4, lines 5-18, teaching web pages viewed using web browser).

Regarding dependent claims 30, 37, and 44, Miller teaches:

wherein said plurality of documents includes documents produced by a word processing program (See Miller, Column 4, lines 5-18 and Column 6, lines 17-27, teaching a word processor application).

Regarding dependent claims 31, 38, and 45, Miller teaches:

wherein said plurality of links comprises at least one Uniform Resource Locator (URL) (See Miller, Column 8, lines 9-28 teaching Uniform Resource Locators).

7. Claims 25-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller (U.S. Patent 6,613,100 B2) in view of Kopetzky ("Visual Preview for Link Traversal on the World Wide Web"), hereafter referred to as "Kopetzky".

Regarding independent claims 25, 32, 39, 46, and 47, Miller teaches:

A method, used in a computer system that includes a user input device coupled to a processor, a display and a memory, for viewing at least one of a plurality of documents, including a document selected as a current document displayed in a first display area of the display (See Miller, Figures 2-5 and Abstract, teaching fetching and viewing a plurality of documents represented by thumbnail images and a display area displaying current document), the method comprising:

(a) in response to a first signal from the user input device (See Figure 3, item 340 user-input device), corresponding to a movement of pointer in first display area (See Miller, Column 6, lines 56 through Column 7, lines 1-29, and Column 4, lines 35-45, wherein Miller teaches a mouse or pointer movement to select document), fetching and displaying in a second display area of the display a representation of content of another document associated by a link to the current document, without selecting the other document as the current document and displaying the other document in the first display area of the display (See Miller, Column 8, lines 9-28 and Figure 5 teaching other display areas 220-250 for displaying thumbnail images of web pages which are linked and related to the currently accessed web page that appears on the display panel 260 (see Miller, Figure 2B);

(b) in response to a second signal indicative of a selection of the link within the document currently being displayed from the user input device, the second signal distinguishable from the first signal, selecting the other document as the current document (See Miller, Column 4, lines 39-44, and Column.. 6, lines 50-66, teaching that a user selects the appropriate thumbnail via user-input device);

(c) displaying the other document as the current document in the first display area of the display (See Miller, Column 8, lines 9-28, teaching that when thumbnail is selected by the user, it causes the web browser to displayed the selected web page on the web browser's display section 130); and

(d) repeatedly performing steps (a), (b), and (c), re-using the first and second display areas of the display, to present different documents in the plurality of documents to user (See Miller, Column 8, lines 21-47, teaching that the user selects thumbnail image of a web page; the web page is displayed and all of the URLs contained within the web page are displayed as thumbnails images of web pages that are associates with the URLs).

Miller further teaches that the user may also select the document represented by the link such that the document is displayed as the current document (See Miller, Figure 4, element 450, and Column 7, lines 48-52).

Miller does not teach expressly displaying in a second display area of the display a representation of content of another document associated by the link to the current document without selecting the other document as the current document and further without displaying the other document in the first display area of the display.

Kopetzky teaches providing a preview of a document represented by a link on a web page when the user performs a mouse over of the link (See Kopetzky, Page 5, Figure 5, and Page 5, "The Presentation of the Link Preview", lines 1-2).

Miller and Kopetzky are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of managing hypermedia data.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the preview of a second document of the Kopetzky with the document viewing system and method of Miller. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide additional information pertaining to the document associated with the hyperlink in order to allow a user to make the determination as to whether he would like to load the document before expending the time necessary to load the document. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kopetzky with Miller in order to provide additional information pertaining to the document associated with the hyperlink in order to allow a user to make the determination as to whether he would like to load the document before expending the time necessary to load the document to obtain the invention as specified in claims 25, 32, 39, 46, and 47.

Regarding dependent claims 26, 33, and 40, Miller teaches:

wherein said representation of content is a thumbnail image of the document (See Miller, Column 8, lines 9-28, teaching a thumbnail image of a web page).

Regarding dependent claims 27, 34, and 41, Miller teaches:

wherein said thumbnail image further includes highlighting of concepts of interest to the user contained within the document (See Miller, Column 6, lines 50-66, and

Column 7, lines 25-39, teaching that thumbnails are displayed corresponding to the chosen category based on user preferences).

Regarding dependent claims 28, 35, and 42, Miller teaches:

wherein said plurality of documents in a non-directed arrangement comprises pages of the World Wide Web (See Miller, Column 8, lines 9-20 and Figure 5, teaching viewing plurality of documents via Internet Explorer).

Regarding dependent claims 29, 36, and 43, Miller teaches:

wherein said plurality of documents includes Hyper Text Markup Language (HTML) documents (See Miller, Column 1, lines 29-43 and Column 4, lines 5-18, teaching web pages viewed using web browser).

Regarding dependent claims 30, 37, and 44, Miller teaches:

wherein said plurality of documents includes documents produced by a word processing program (See Miller, Column 4, lines 5-18, and Column 6, lines 17-27, teaching a word processor application).

Regarding dependent claims 31, 38, and 45, Miller teaches:

wherein said plurality of links comprises at least one Uniform Resource Locator (URL) (See Miller, Column 8, lines 9-28 teaching Uniform Resource Locator s).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 25-47 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached at (571) 272-4136.

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Laurie Ries
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2176